

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/807,641

Applicant(s)

BERRY, JOE

Examiner

Jennifer H. Gay

Art Unit

3672

All Participants:

(1) Jennifer H. Gay.

(2) John Peck.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 September 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

2,16,17,25,29

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney to inform him that the case was in condition for allowance except for a few minor errors in claims 2, 16, 17, 25, and 29. The error in claim 2 was the recitation of "at least two gripping arms" when claim 5, which depends from claim 2, also recites "at least two gripping arms". It was suggested that claim 2 be changed to --the at least two gripping devices-- and applicant's attorney agreed. The error in claim 16 was the lack of antecedent basis for "the first gripper device" and "the second gripper device". Applicant's attorney agreed to change claim 16 to recite --a first gripper device-- and --a second gripper device--. The error in claim 17 appeared to be that it recited "a second gripper device" performing two different tasks and the examiner suggested that the first occurrence of "a second gripper device" be changed to --the first gripper device--. Applicant's attorney explained that the second gripper device was indeed performing two different tasks as the second tubular was being held by the first tubular located in the preparation opening. Based on this explanation, the examiner suggested that the second occurrence of "a second gripper device" be changed to --the second gripper device--. The error in claim 25 was that "at least two gripping devices" should be changed to --the at least two gripping devices--, applicant's attorney agreed to this change. Applicant's attorney also agreed to change "gripping devices" in claim 29 to --gripping arms--. An examiner's amendmet to follow.